

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10                  AT TACOMA

11                  CHRISTOPHER D. MADDOX,

12                  Petitioner,

13                  v.

14                  CHRISTINE GREGOIRE, *et al*,

15                  Respondents.

16                  Case No. C06-5524RBL-KLS

17                  ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

18         This matter is before the Court on petitioner's petition for writ of *habeas corpus* pursuant to 28  
19 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner has been granted *in forma pauperis* status in this case. See Order Granting  
20 Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*, dated the same date herewith.

21         On September 11, 2006, petitioner filed his application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and a number  
22 of exhibits containing state court briefs and state court opinions. See Exhibits A-E (Dkt. #1). Nowhere  
23 among any of those documents, however, is an actual petition for writ of *habeas corpus* pursuant to 28  
24 U.S.C. § 2254. Accordingly, petitioner shall file such a petition in accordance with the proper rules for  
25 doing so by **no later than October 29, 2006**, or this matter shall be recommended for dismissal without  
26 prejudice for failure to prosecute.

27         The Court further notes that petitioner has named Christine Gregoire as one of the respondents in  
28 this case, who is the governor of the State of Washington. Rule 2(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254

1 Cases in the United States District Courts, however, reads in relevant part:

2 If the applicant is presently in custody pursuant to the state judgment in question, the  
3 application shall be in the form of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in which the  
state officer having custody of the applicant shall be named as respondent

4 Thus, a petition for *habeas corpus* relief must name the state officer having custody of him or her as the  
5 respondent to the petition. California Supreme Court, 21 F.3d 359, 360 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994) (citations omitted)  
6 (failure to name petitioner's custodian deprives federal courts of personal jurisdiction). This person  
7 typically is warden of the institution where the petitioner is incarcerated. Thus, while petitioner does  
8 appear to have named the superintendent of the institution where he currently is incarcerated as the other  
9 respondent in this case, it should be noted that if petitioner chooses to file a petition as directed herein, Ms.  
10 Gregoire is not a proper respondent here.

11 The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to petitioner and counsel for respondent.

12 DATED this 29th day of September, 2006.

13  
14  
15   
Karen L. Strombom  
16 United States Magistrate Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28